arXiv:1511.07074v1 [math.LO] 22 Nov 2015

THE PEIRCE AXIOM SCHEME AND SUPREMA

P.L. ROBINSON

Abstract. We present equivalents to the Peirce axiom scheme and highlight its relevance for pairwise suprema.

With the conditional ($\supset$) as its only logical connective and with modus ponens (MP) as its only inference rule, the Implicational Propositional Calculus (IPC) is commonly founded on the following three axiom schemes:

(IPC_0) $[(A \supset B) \supset A] \supset A$ (*the Peirce axiom scheme*);

(IPC_1) $A \supset (B \supset A)$ (*affirmation of the consequent*);

(IPC_2) $[A \supset (B \supset C)] \supset [(A \supset B) \supset (A \supset C)]$ (*self-distributivity*).

Our aim here is to offer equivalents for the Peirce axiom scheme and highlight a significant rôle that it plays within the IPC. A convenient DIY introduction to the IPC may be found on pages 24-25 of [4].

Throughout, we shall assume modus ponens and the axiom schemes IPC_1 and IPC_2. This comment applies in particular to the statement of theorems: MP, IPC_1 and IPC_2 will be implicit assumptions in each of them; whether or not the Peirce scheme IPC_0 is assumed will be stated explicitly. It is in this sense that our equivalents to the Peirce scheme should be understood: each of them is equivalent to IPC_0 in the presence of MP, IPC_1 and IPC_2.

It will be convenient to begin by recalling some elementary properties of IPC that do not require IPC_0. Perhaps the most useful of these is the Deduction Theorem (DT): if $\Gamma, A \vdash B$ (that is, if there is a deduction of B from A and the set Γ of well-formed formulas) then $\Gamma \vdash A \supset B$ (that is, there is a deduction of $A \supset B$ from Γ alone); as a special case, if $A \vdash B$ then $A \supset B$ is a theorem. Because of this, we shall feel free to write $A \vdash B$ and $\vdash A \supset B$ interchangeably without mention. A particular consequence of DT is Hypothetical Syllogism (HS): $A \supset B, B \supset C \vdash A \supset C$ as a derived inference rule; alternatively, if $A \vdash B$ and $B \vdash C$ then $A \vdash C$. Another useful elementary fact is that $A \supset A$ is a theorem of IPC without IPC_0; it typically appears as a step on the way to DT (from which metatheorem it otherwise follows at once).

One direction of the following equivalence already appears in [4].

Theorem 1. *The Peirce axiom scheme IPC_0 is equivalent to the axiom scheme*
(IPC_0') $(A \supset Q) \supset \{[(A \supset B) \supset Q] \supset Q\}$.

Proof. Assume IPC_0. HS yields

$$A \supset Q, Q \supset B \vdash A \supset B$$

whence DT yields

$$A \supset Q \vdash (Q \supset B) \supset (A \supset B).$$

Consequently, from $A \supset Q$ and $(A \supset B) \supset Q$ as hypotheses, we deduce $(Q \supset B) \supset Q$ by HS. Now, IPC_0 gives $\vdash [(Q \supset B) \supset Q] \supset Q$ whence an application of MP produces

$$A \supset Q, (A \supset B) \supset Q \vdash Q$$

and two applications of DT bring us to IPC_0' as a theorem scheme.

Assume IPC_0' as stated. With Q replaced by A this yields

$$\vdash (A \supset A) \supset \{[(A \supset B) \supset A] \supset A\}.$$

As $A \supset A$ is a theorem, an application of MP brings us to IPC_0 as a theorem scheme. □

The approach to our second equivalent for the Peirce axiom scheme starts from a simple observation within the classical Propositional Calculus. As regards its truth-functional nature, disjunction may be expressed in terms of the conditional: explicitly, all Boolean valuations agree on $A \vee B$ and $(A \supset B) \supset B$. This is one of the less obvious semantic relationships between logical connectives, among the many to which Smullyan draws attention in [5] and elsewhere. On this point, see also D4 in Section 11 of [1].

Accordingly, let us define (as an abbreviation)

$$A \vee B \coloneqq (A \supset B) \supset B.$$

The following is called $\vee$-Introduction in [3].

Theorem 2. *$A \vdash A \vee B$ and $B \vdash A \vee B$.*

Proof. For the first deduction, MP gives $A, A \supset B \vdash B$ and then DT gives $A \vdash (A \supset B) \supset B$. The second amounts to an instance of IPC_1. □

The result of the following theorem is called $\vee$-Elimination in [3].

Theorem 3. *Assume the Peirce axiom scheme. If $A \vdash Q$ and $B \vdash Q$ then $A \vee B \vdash Q$.*

Proof. The equivalent to the Peirce scheme presented in Theorem 1 justifies

$$A \supset Q \vdash [(A \supset B) \supset Q] \supset Q$$

while an application of HS justifies

$$B \supset Q, (A \supset B) \supset B \vdash (A \supset B) \supset Q.$$

An application of MP now justifies

$$A \supset Q, B \supset Q, (A \supset B) \supset B \vdash Q$$

whence an application of DT justifies

$$A \supset Q, B \supset Q \vdash [(A \supset B) \supset B] \supset Q$$

or

$$A \supset Q, B \supset Q \vdash (A \vee B) \supset Q.$$

Finally, if $A \vdash Q$ and $B \vdash Q$ then $\vdash A \supset Q$ and $\vdash B \supset Q$ so that $\vdash (A \vee B) \supset Q$ and therefore $A \vee B \vdash Q$. □

We may regard this theorem as providing formal justification, on the basis of the Peirce axiom scheme, for the inference rule 'from $A \vdash Q$ and $B \vdash Q$ infer $A \vee B \vdash Q$' or

$$\frac{A \supset Q, B \supset Q}{(A \vee B) \supset Q}$$

which we shall refer to as $\vee$E (for $\vee$-Elimination).

We have thus established one direction in the following result, which presents a new equivalent to the Peirce axiom scheme; recall our standing assumption that MP, IPC_1 and IPC_2 are in force.

Theorem 4. *The Peirce axiom scheme IPC_0:*

$$[(A \supset B) \supset A] \supset A$$

is equivalent to the inference rule $\vee E$:

$$A \supset Q, B \supset Q \vdash (A \vee B) \supset Q.$$

Proof. For the reverse direction, assume the inference rule $\vee$E. Now, hypothesize $(A \supset B) \supset A$. This hypothesis has as a trivial consequence the theorem $A \supset A$. An application of HS to our hypothesis and the instance $B \supset (A \supset B)$ of IPC_1 yields the consequence $B \supset A$. Two applications of MP give

$$(A \supset B) \supset A, A \supset B \vdash B$$

whence DT reveals that our hypothesis also has $(A \supset B) \supset B$ $(= A \vee B)$ as a consequence. In summary, $(A \supset B) \supset A$ has as consequences $A \supset A$, $B \supset A$, $A \vee B$. Next, our new inference rule $\vee$E with $Q := A$ provides the further deduction

$$A \supset A, B \supset A \vdash (A \vee B) \supset A.$$

Lastly, MP applied to the consequences $A \vee B$ and $(A \vee B) \supset A$ results in

$$(A \supset B) \supset A \vdash A$$

and by DT we arrive at $[(A \supset B) \supset A] \supset A$ as a theorem scheme. □

A reformulation of this new equivalent to the Peirce axiom scheme is of interest.

Let wf denote the set comprising all well-formed formulas. Initially, assume only MP along with IPC_1 and IPC_2. Declare $A \in wf$ and $B \in wf$ to be (syntactically) *equivalent* precisely when both $A \vdash B$ and $B \vdash A$ (thus, precisely when both $A \supset B$ and $B \supset A$ are theorems). This evidently defines an equivalence relation $\equiv$ on wf; transitivity holds by virtue of HS. Write $\mathbb{L}$ for the set of $\equiv$-classes in wf and write $[A]$ for the $\equiv$-class of A.

The set $\mathbb{L}$ is partially ordered by declaring that $[A] \leqslant [B]$ precisely when $A \vdash B$ (equivalently, precisely when $A \supset B$ is a theorem); it is readily checked that this does indeed well-define a partial order. Notice that the poset $(\mathbb{L}, \leqslant)$ has a top element: namely, $[T]$ where T is any theorem; if A is any well-formed formula then $A \vdash T$ is a triviality. By contrast, $(\mathbb{L}, \leqslant)$ has no bottom element; semantically, a well-formed formula representing a bottom element must take the value 0 in any Boolean valuation, but each well-formed formula built from $\supset$ alone takes the value 1 when every propositional variable is assigned 1 as its value.

In these terms, we now have the following reformulation of Theorem 4 (with our usual standing assumption).

Theorem 5. *The Peirce axiom scheme IPC_0 is equivalent to the requirement that each pair $[A], [B]$ in $\mathbb{L}$ has $[A \vee B]$ as its supremum.*

Proof. Theorem 2 tells us that $[A]$ and $[B]$ have $[A \vee B]$ as an upper bound. Theorem 3 tells us that if the Peirce axiom scheme holds then $[A \vee B]$ is actually the least upper bound of $[A]$ and $[B]$. The reverse direction of Theorem 4 implies that if $[A \vee B]$ is the least upper bound of $[A]$ and $[B]$ then IPC_0 holds. This concludes the proof. □

Thus, for the Implicational Propositional Calculus, $(\mathbb{L}, \leqslant)$ is a (topped, bottomless) join-semilattice in which pairwise suprema are given by

$$\sup\{[A], [B]\} = [(A \supset B) \supset B].$$

For an introductory account of semilattices, we refer to [2].

References

[1] A. Church, *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, Princeton University Press (1956).

[2] G. Grätzer, *Lattice Theory - First Concepts and Distributive Lattices*, W.H. Freeman (1971); Dover Publications (2009).

[3] S.C. Kleene, *Mathematical Logic*, John Wiley (1967); Dover Publications (2002).

[4] J. W. Robbin, *Mathematical Logic - A First Course*, W.A. Benjamin (1969); Dover Publications (2006).

[5] R.M. Smullyan, *Logical Labyrinths*, A.K. Peters (2009).

Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611 USA
E-mail address: paulr@ufl.edu